DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 264 UD 033 951

AUTHOR Allen, Mike; Ulrich, Tammie; Trejo, Mary; Bartanen, Michael; Schroeder, Anthony

TITLE Diversity in United States Forensics: A Report of Research Conducted for the American Forensic Association.

SPONS AGENCY American Forensic Association.

PUB DATE 2000-11-00

NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Forensic Association/National Communication Association (Seattle, WA, November 2000). Funded by a Grant on Diversity in Forensics from the American Forensic Association.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS College Students; Debate; *Diversity (Student); Equal Education; *Females; Financial Support; Gender Issues; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; *Minority Groups; *Persuasive Discourse; Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the participation of women and minorities in the United States forensic community. Surveys sent to a large cross-section of the college and university forensic community examined such issues as: academic mission; funding sources for the forensic program; program evaluation; program size; program activities; program records regarding diversity; evaluation of program diversity; percentage of program participants by gender and ethnicity; and rates of minority participation in program activities. Results indicated that women were well represented as participants in forensic activities, with women having about a 50-percent participation rate. Approximately 25 percent of participants in forensic activities were of non-European descent. The number of minority and women participants was most affected when diversity was used as a criterion for evaluating the program and formal records were kept. Participation rates did not differ when comparing debate, individual events, or mock trial activities. Factors such as the nature of the institution, funding sources, and measures of program success were largely unrelated to the extent of participation by various groups. Urban institutions tended to have higher levels of minority participation. (Contains 57 bibliographic references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

UD

ED 449 264

DIVERSITY IN UNITED STATES FORENSICS:

A REPORT OF RESEARCH CONDUCTED FOR THE

AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

M. Allen

1

Mike Allen
Principal Investigator

Tammie Ulrich
Graduate Student Assistant

Mary Trejo
Chair, AFA Professional Development and Support Committee

Michael Bartanen
Chair, ad hoc Subcommittee for Research Diversity Support

Anthony Schroeder
Director of Forensics Representative

Technical Report for
American Forensic Association
Grant on Diversity in Forensics
For Presentation at the joint
American Forensic Association/National Communication Association
Convention

Seattle, WA
November, 2000

Mike Allen (Ph.D., Michigan State University, 1987) is Professor and Tammie Ulrich (MA, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2000) is both in the Department of Communication at University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201. Mary Trejo (Ph.D., University of Tulsa, 1983) is Director of the UTEP Forensics Program in the Department of Communication at the University of Texas-El Paso, El Paso, TX 79968-0550. Michael Bartanen (Ph.D., University of Southern California, 1980) is Professor at the University of Puget Sound, Tacoma, WA 98447. Anthony Schroeder is Director of Forensics at Eastern New Mexico. The report and research, while funded by a grant from the AFA, reflects the views of the authors and not the official view of the AFA.

Suggested running head: AFA Diversity Report

UD033951

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The results of a survey of the forensics community about the level of participation by women and minorities were undertaken. The results demonstrate that gender equity (approximately 50% participation) appears achieved. About 25% of the participants in forensics are nonEuropeans. The number of minority and women participants is most affected when diversity is used as a criterion to evaluate the program and formal records are kept. Participation rates did not differ when comparing debate, individual events, or mock trial activities. Features like the nature of the academic institution, source of funding, and measures of program success were largely unrelated to the extent of participation of various groups.

DIVERSITY IN UNITED STATES FORENSICS: A REPORT OF RESEARCH CONDUCTED FOR THE AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION

The changing demographics in the United States from a nation with the majority of population from European descendents to a country where the majority of citizens are nonEuropean reflect a slow but steady process. Already, the District of Columbia, New Mexico, Hawaii, and California are states where the majority of the population is nonwhite. Competitive forensics in the early history was dominated by white male participants and there is a much more diverse group of participants. The challenge is whether the activity can reflect the growing national diversity in the general population as well as the expected growing diversity on the college campus.

The importance of forensics as a source of training in public speaking and critical thinking has long been a source of belief. A recent meta-analysis published in *Communication Education* (Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt, & Louden, 1999) indicates a significant improvement in critical thinking when involved in competitive forensics. The improvement was larger than a classroom experience in public speaking or argumentation. The value of the activity as a means for educational improvement receives support.

This survey of forensics is intended to assess the nature of diversity in the current participants across many different forms of forensic participation. A central issue in the academy is the transition from a majority white and male college/university student population to a nonwhite and female population. The appeal of competitive forensics to white males may not be as great to other groups. As the demographics change the ability of the activity to remain healthy and a viable activity becomes questioned if it cannot attract persons of color and women

as participants. This survey is an effort to provide a snapshot view of the forensics community that serves an informational function to the leadership in forensics. The survey should provide some information about the level of diversity found in the programs as well as soliciting views from directors of forensics, coaches, and advisers about the need for improvements and suggestions that could address any inequities found to exist.

Forensics is an activity that can take many forms. Debate provides a term with many different manifestations of the same activity based on the organizational norms. National Debate Tournament (NDT) is sponsored as part of the American Forensic Association (AFA) but debate is also the province of the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA), the National Educational Debate Association (NEDA), and the American Parliamentary Debate Association (APDA), to name a few examples. Individual events, speaking contests where a single person speaks in some identified manner (impromptu, extemporaneous, reader's theatre, interpretive (poetry, prose, duo, etc.), oratory, expository, communication analysis, radio commentary, puppetry, storytelling), but even this is not entirely an individual person (duo and reader's theatre involve multiple persons). Mock trial provides a contest that involves a demonstration of public speaking skill, as well as knowledge about legal issues, and preparation in a formalized situation. Some events are held for entertainment, enlightenment, as well as to provide a forum to demonstrate skills that win trophies and scholarships. In addition, outreach activities to community groups, high schools (including summer workshops), civic, and cultural events also can provide a basis for forensic application of skills to serve the community.

The structure of these activities represents an equal amount of variation from institution to institution. In some cases, there are multiple and separate organizations that pursue various avenues of forensics located in the same institution. Funding can come from a variety of

methods, depending on whether the organization is a student club, a departmental, college, or university recognized organization. Flexibility and diversity represents the structure across the various colleges and universities. This flexibility involves how the activity is located within the organization (a student club, something run out of an administrative section, a activity located in a department—prelaw, political science, communication, etc.,) as well as the source of financing.

Speech and communication departments have historically played a large role in the formation and support of these efforts. Since 1917 with the formation of the Speech Communication Association (now the National Communication Association) the emphasis on the spoken word as opposed to the written word (in English Departments which originally housed most "speech" scholars). There has long been a recognition since the works of Aristotle, Plato, and Cicero of the centrality of training and understanding of public oral communication as necessary and expected as part of the norms of western institutions (whether it is religion, business, politics, medicine or even agriculture).

The challenge is the inclusion of populations (principally women and minorities) that have not been typically considered a mainstream source of support for public address in the academy. Most of the dominant views of public address as well as the participants in public address have been white European males and this historical view has generated the perception of dominance by this group to the exclusion or lack of inclusion of other groups.

One consideration is whether competitive forensic program formally keep records and are evaluated on the basis of diversity. Higher educational institutions for both student admissions and the hiring of faculty and staff must typically be expected to comply with various standards set by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The role of affirmative action (in all its guises) has been a central and controversial issue in higher education. One consideration is to

what extent forensic organizations are required to meet these expectations. An ancillary consideration is whether records are kept on this aspect of the organization. A key element in the evaluation of the effectiveness of diversity efforts or the examination of historical trends is a comparison to various historical records. The lack of records makes any assessment difficult to undertake.

Another aspect of diversity in forensics is the degree to which there exists diversity in the college and university. A forensics program could not reflect a diverse set of persons if the college or university students demonstrate little diversity. The members of the program come from the pool of available students, if a student body has few persons of color it is unlikely that the level of diversity found among the participants will be substantially larger. In assessments of diversity a necessary comparison should be to the demographics of the general student body.

METHODS

Survey Questions

A complete copy of the survey as it was sent to the participants is attached as Appendix A. The survey begins with a series of questions designed to elicit information about the universities and the nature of funding, size of the program, what methods of success are typically considered when assessing the program.

Sample

The sample was the mailing lists provided by the following organizations: American Forensic Association (AFA), American Mock Trial Association (AMTA), American Parliamentary Debate Association (APDA), Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA), Delta Sigma Rho-Tappa Kappa Alpha (DSR-TKA), National Educational Debate Association (NEDA), Phi Kappa Delta (PKD), and Pi Rho Phi (junior college forensic organization). This

represents a large cross section of college and university forensic community. The organizations represent a combination of different approaches to the activity and in some cases a college or university had memberships in several of these organizations simultaneously. A total of 227 responses were received out of the 903 surveys mailed out for a response rate of 25%.

The decision was made to send only one survey to each program when the program was listed in multiple organizations. However, given that a university may have separately run programs for different activities, a separate survey was sent to those programs at the same university but located in different departments, organizations, or places in the college/university. For example, a mock trial program may list the director in the political science department while the CEDA contact person is in the communication department. In that case a survey would have been sent to each person rather than only one survey to the institution.

RESULTS

Open-ended Responses

Does Diversity Exist?

A complete collection of all responses to the open-ended questions is provided in Appendix B. The answers run the gamut from there is no problem with diversity at all to the particular forensics practices are dominated by the white male elite. The diversity in forensics is more evident in the opinions expressed by the respondents than any other general or prevailing opinions. The statistical analysis provides one set of responses to the issues, but the interpretation of that information comes from a more reasoned analysis in terms of examining how the directors/coaches/advisers find the level of diversity in the particular activity.

One expression in a few responses was that the view of diversity in the survey dealing with gender and race/ethnicity was limited. Several respondents pointed out that diversity could

be expressed in terms of lifestyles, sexual practices, degree of ability (and disability), age, social class, and major program of academic study. A few responses even expressed the idea of making clear that diverse ideas were also acceptable on the part of the participants, that viewpoints not in the mainstream would be tolerated and encouraged as a part of the activity. There are many methods of types of diversity and the opinions reflect different perspectives on what constitutes a "diverse" set of participants. This consideration may require forensic organizations to consider how to reconsider what kinds of diversity should constitute the expectations. The need to establish a sense of what kinds of diversity should be encouraged becomes a consideration within an institutional framework.

A number of responses basically concluded that the gender "gap" was largely reduced and no longer a serious issue in forensics. The gap about race was still relatively large but that the gender issues in forensics had changed from the previous domination by white males. This perception was not universally accepted, particularly when several respondents referred to the "elite" teams at the senior level of competition.

Several persons pointed out that their program may not be diverse but other programs are diverse. That diversity in the region was not great but was larger in other regions where the number of persons of color participating was larger. The responses indicate sensitivity to the idea that diversity may change in terms of the expectations or requirements based on geography or other circumstances. One respondent pointed out that the team was entirely African American, but the university was a historically black college and had little diversity in the student body.

<u>What Actions Could Be Taken to Increase Diversity</u>

About what could be done to change current levels of gender and racial participation created a variety of innovative ideas as well as many respondents who answered that nothing can be done. A number of responses focused on the need for scholarships, special awards and recognition, as well as recruiting as a means of increasing diversity of participants.

One serious question is whether participation by underrepresented groups is necessary or desirable. A number of responses defined diversity in a manner that focused on other aspects and therefore questioned the need for this approach or investigation. Two aspects must be considered in this vein: (a) is the current format not attractive or useful, and (b) to what extent providing opportunity is necessary versus guaranteeing participation.

Numerical Responses

General Descriptive Statistics Gathered about Forensics Participants

Table 1 in Appendix C provides the raw frequencies for the various responses to the individual questions requesting numerical estimates. The description provides that the institutions involved forensics are primarily four year (68%), teaching (73%), undergraduate (81%) institutions.

The analysis proceeds to consider the relationship of gender and ethnic/racial diversity to the various features of the program. The goal was to examine what kinds of elements of a program are related to various measures of diversity.

Gender diversity is reported that approximately 54% of members of debate teams are female while 46% are male. In individual events the figure favors women by a slightly larger margin with 58% of the members female and 42% male, this percentage is a bit different for mock trial where the percentage is 51% female and 49% male. Overall,

directors/coaches/advisers report that women are well represented as participants in forensic activities.

The picture regarding ethnic diversity is different. In activities classified as debate the percentage of European Americans is about 70%, about 10% Asian Americans, 7% Hispanic, 7% African American, 2% Native American, and 4% other/foreign/unknown. Debate activities are dominated by European Americans, however minority participation is not insubstantial.

In individual events the percentages are similar with European Americans represented at 71%, Asian Americans makeup 12% of the participants, 7% are Hispanic, 5% are African American, 3% Native American, and 2% other/foreign/unknown. The results are consistent with the percentages reported in debate participation.

Mock trial participants demonstrate similar statistics with 74% of the participants European Americans, 11% Asian Americans, 6% Hispanic Americans, 6% African Americans, 1% Native Americans, and 2% other/foreign/unknown. This percentage is similar to the level of participation reported in the other types of programs.

The numbers represent a relatively consistent pattern across the broad types of forensic activities. Basically, the majority of participants are European Americans but there is a substantial portion of non-white participation slightly more than one in four persons involved in the activity is a person of color. Gender participation appears to be relatively equitable in terms of the number of participants. While the distribution of participants varied greatly across the programs surveyed, the activity overall appears to have substantial numbers of women involved.

Institution Description and Participant Diversity

Table 2 in Appendix C contains the matrix with all the associations between the institutional descriptions and the reported percentage of participants. A positive correlation

indicates that the institutional feature is associated with increased levels of participation while a negative correlation indicates lower levels of participation.

The one pattern observed was that female had lower participation rates as institutions considered: (a) research, (b) private, (c) four-year, (d) graduate, and (e) urban. The indication is that more "exclusive," expensive, and less focused on the undergraduate teaching experience the less the number of females participating.

The number of Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans was increased when the institution was considered urban. The number of European Americans was significantly diminished in this case. No feature was found to be relevant to the level of participation for African Americans. These results suggest that diversity for several groups is associated with programs found in urban areas and supports a number of participants that suggested in the open-ended responses the need to develop Urban Debate Leagues.

Funding Source and Participant Diversity

The results of the relationship between the source of funding and diversity of the participants are reported in Table 3 in Appendix C. The results demonstrate no real sets of associations. While two correlations are significant (male and department, Hispanic and endowment) the probability of Type I error (false positive) is substantial (probability of 5%) when given the large number of tests conducted. The results basically indicate that the source of funding probably generate little impact on the level of diversity of forensics participants.

Measures of Success and Participant Diversity

This section considered whether the determinants of program success were related to the participation rates of various groups. The only significant findings indicated the women were more likely to participate if the size of the program in terms of the number of participants was a

criterion for success. Men were less likely to participate on that basis but more likely to make up a majority of the program when outcomes like winning awards and participating in national championships was considered. A full correlation matrix is found on Table 4 in Appendix C.

The only racial difference was found for Asian American, the rates of participation were reduced when number of participants and/or issues relating the number of entries was used as a measure of the success for the program. The finding may indicate that success rather than participation may be more important to this particular group.

However, for the most part, the type of success measure was not a particularly important predictor of the relative participation rates of the various groups. This finding indicates that the structure of the program evaluation per se is not the basis for the rate of minority participation in the current forensic programs.

Team Size/Diversity Emphasis and Participant Diversity

The size of the team as reported by the respondents made only a slight impact as the proportion of women showed a slight decline and the number of Asians dropped. However, this is not a particularly large effect and is not consistent with the expected rise in male percentage that is not significant. A full set of the results for this section appears in Table 5 in Appendix C

The issue of whether diversity is formally assessed and records kept was determined to be significantly correlated with diversity in participation. The number of women and most minority groups significantly increased and the number of men and European participants dropped as a percentage when diversity was formally assessed. The results indicate that the largest set of associations occur when diversity is a criterion for evaluation and records are kept.

CONCLUSIONS

As purely a numbers issue, the gender gap for forensics competition is probably closed but the race/ethnic gap still exists. But this gap should not be viewed as alarming as some persons may represent. The level of minority participation could and probably should be improved, but the level of participation of non-European Americans is over 25% of the participants. The question is whether this lower participation reflects simply a lower probability of attending college rather than something specific to the particular activity.

The sets of associations conducted on various aspect of the program and the level of diversity in the participants demonstrates a few features of interest. Urban institutions demonstrate higher levels of minority participation, probably reflecting a more diverse student population to recruit from. This feature may indicate that the support of Urban Debate Leagues would benefit the programs in the long term.

Probably the most important finding is that when diversity is used as a criterion for program assessment and when records are kept, diversity increases. The results indicate that the more diversity is incorporated as a formal element of the program, the more likely that minority representation will increase (there is corresponding drop in the percentage of European participation reported). The question is whether minority involvement expands the level of participation or trades off against the number of participants cannot be assessed in this report. The key is to focus on the expansion of the opportunity to participate rather than creating a process that favor any particular group.

One limitation is that this survey is of directors/coaches/advisers of programs and does not directly measure the level of various forms of participation. Any bias, distortion, or incompleteness on the part of the respondents may make these data not fully representative of the activity. Since there are not simply historical artifacts that can be obtained and compared, it is

difficult to determine the relative accuracy of this memory. A number of respondents remarked that the rates of participation vary from year to year dramatically, so any yearly estimate may not be reflective of the entire history of the program.

There are several features that this report did not consider that should be addressed by the forensics community: (a) graduate school/coaching/teaching issues, (b) resource support differences, and (c) success for competitors. These issues come from issues not addressed in this survey but raised in a few by respondents in the open-ended responses to the survey questions.

The need to develop more diversity in the graduate student assistant and coaching ranks was commented on by various persons in the openended responses. There was no survey information about the race/gender of the coaches or graduate assistant coaches. The normal expectation is that as the evolution or inclusion of various groups increases the result would be a natural process that would reflect increased numbers at the levels of coaching/teaching. However, no real information exists on this issue and that might be the basis for future concern. One aspect of recruiting and retention in the activity might involve the degree to which leadership in the activity reflects the same expectations of diversity sought for participants in the activity.

Resource issues were mentioned in a number of open responses. The need for greater resource commitments to those with less means may provide a serious limitation for minority participation. The lower socioeconomic status of many minorities may make the ability to participate in an extra-curricular activity more difficult to sustain. More attention might be given to scholarships and other forms of financial support. One commentary was about the need for day-care for minority participants, particularly older students with children that require a separate consideration. The need to maintain employment may reduce the ability of a person to

prepare for the activity (reducing the probability of success) as well as limiting the flexibility necessary to participate in the activity.

The data in this report consider only the quantity of participation and not the quality of resources or success provided to those groups however, and such a gap may still exist. No effort was made to assess the quality of the participation in terms of success or the emotional reaction of the participants. An activity may be diverse but the participants of some particular group either less successful or treated differently. For example, the National Football League and College football had extremely few African Americans playing the position of quarterback, even though the majority of other positions were filled with a significant number of African Americans. This provides an example of an activity that even though not only appearing integrated, but over-represented by one group still did not necessarily represent a standard of equality because of internal sets of parameters that foreclosed some opportunities within the activity to a few of the participants. No data exists in this report to evaluate the potential of this claim and additional research would be required to evaluate this view.

The level of participation however by minorities is substantial and should not be underestimated when compared to other university and college organizations and activities. The report presents some interesting conclusions about our enterprise and some challenges that we should consider.

February 8, 2000

Dear Forensic Educator:

The American Forensic Association has commissioned a survey of forensic educators in the United States about issues relating to diversity and participation in forensics. I am sending you a survey in the hopes that you will fill it out and return it to me in the enclosed envelope. The response to the survey is designed to be anonymous, so you are not identified on the basis of the survey. We are surveying not only members of the AFA, but other organizations that participate in the educational use of public speaking.

What we are interested in learning is to what degree forensic participants reflect the ethnic, racial, cultural, and other diversity found in the United States and among college and university students. We are also interested in examining the nature of that participation in terms of what kinds of events, institutions, and programs are involved. We also would like to find out to what degree such considerations play a part in the design, implementation, and evaluation of your program. Finally, we would like to know if you have any suggestions about changes in forensics that would increase or change the level of participation of various groups.

If you would like to receive the results of this investigation, like to engage in a dialog about the issues or concerns of this survey, or provide additional suggestions, you can contact us at mikealle@uwm.edu.

We hope, as a result of this survey, provide the AFA and forensics community a snapshot description of the current participants. Along with this snapshot will come a view of the degree to which diversity issues are part of the practices of the participating programs. As important are the suggestions that could help improve the process of adaptation of our activity into the next century.

We hope you will take the time to complete and return the enclosed instrument. We hope that you will give the matter some thought and reflection. The activity of forensics has enriched the lives of thousands of individuals in a number of ways. We hope to maintain and enlarge on this beneficial educational endeavor.

Sincerely,

Mike Allen, Ph.D.

Professor

This is the electronic mail version—change is noted in bold

February 8, 2000

Dear Forensic Educator:

The American Forensic Association has commissioned a survey of forensic educators in the United States about issues relating to diversity and participation in forensics. I am sending you a survey in the hopes that you will fill it out and return it to me in the enclosed envelope. The response to the survey is designed to be **confidential, so your responses would not be not be individually identified**. As soon as we print your response we will remove any identification from the message. We are surveying not only members of the AFA, but other organizations that participate in the educational use of public speaking.

What we are interested in learning is to what degree forensic participants reflect the ethnic, racial, cultural, and other diversity found in the United States and among college and university students. We are also interested in examining the nature of that participation in terms of what kinds of events, institutions, and programs are involved. We also would like to find out to what degree such considerations play a part in the design, implementation, and evaluation of your program. Finally, we would like to know if you have any suggestions about changes in forensics that would increase or change the level of participation of various groups.

If you would like to receive the results of this investigation, like to engage in a dialog about the issues or concerns of this survey, or provide additional suggestions, you can contact us at mikealle@uwm.edu.

We hope, as a result of this survey, provide the AFA and forensics community a snapshot description of the current participants. Along with this snapshot will come a view of the degree to which diversity issues are part of the practices of the participating programs. As important are the suggestions that could help improve the process of adaptation of our activity into the next century.

We hope you will take the time to complete and return the enclosed instrument. We hope that you will give the matter some thought and reflection. The activity of forensics has enriched the lives of thousands of individuals in a number of ways. We hope to maintain and enlarge on this beneficial educational endeavor.

Sincerely,

Mike Allen, Ph.D.
Professor

SURVEY OF DIVERSITY IN FORENSICS

Mike Allen, A Professor at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee is conducting a survey for the American Forensic Association (AFA). We would like you to answer some questions about your program. This entire process should take about 30 minutes.

We are mailing to all directors of college and university forensic programs for which we can obtain a listing. Do **not** put your name anywhere on this form. We would like to collect this data anonymously and do not want to be able to link individual responses to a particular person. Our intent is to take the responses to this survey and report then at the National Communication Association Convention in Seattle, 2000 as well as prepare a report for the AFA.

You understand that your participation in this survey is completely voluntary.

If you would like to receive a copy of the overall results, please contact me at the address below and if you have any questions or suggestions, please contact me at:

Mike Allen
Department of Communication
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI 53201
Mikealle@uwm.edu

If you have any complaints about your treatment in this survey, please contact:

Dr. Berri Forman, IRB
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
Environmental Health, Safety, and Risk Management
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Box 413
Milwaukee, WI 53201
(414) 229-6016

By filling out the following survey you indicate that you understand these instructions and are giving informed consent to be a subject in this study. You also are indicating that you are 18 years old.

This project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board for the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for a one year period.

AFA DIVERSITY SURVEY

1. What kind of Academic mission/setting reflects your institution? (circle all those that apply)

Research Teaching Private Public 4year 2year

Undergraduate Graduate Land Grant Urban

Other _____

2. What is the source of financing for your Forensic Program—please provide approximate percentages in blanks if more than one source.

_____ University Allocation
_____ College Allocation
_____ Department Allocation
_____ Student Government/Activities
_____ Endowment income (permanent)
_____ Self-financed-sales, donations, workshops, tournaments
_____ Other (please specify)

3. What measures are used to evaluate the success of your program (rate on a 5 most important to a 1 not important scale)

_____ number of awards
_____ number of student participants
_____ number of tournaments/entries
_____ representation at national championships
_____ minority and gender diversity
_____ fund raising ability
_____ positive visibility in community/campus
_____ outreach efforts to high schools (workshops, student recruitment)
_____ other measures (list them and importance)

4. How large would you describe your Forensics Program on a 10 (huge) to 1 (tiny) program _____

5. If you were describing your program how would you describe the nature of what your program participates in: (rate on a 100% basis, that is the percentages total 100)

_____ Debate -----which types:

_____ Individual Events----list types:

_____ Mock Trial

_____ Community and School Outreach—list types

_____ Other

6. To what extent is the diversity of participants a criteria on which the program is evaluated (use a 1 important to 5 not important scale) _____

7. Do you keep any formal records on diversity of the participants in your program?___yes___no

8. What percentage of your program is: ___male___female
___Native American___Hispanic American___European American
___Asian American____African American____unknown
___Other:

9. Do you feel the program represents the level of the diversity in your student body?___yes___no
If no, does the program over or under represent the following groups when compared to the diversity of your students: (indicate in space whether it is over or under representation)

____ Native Americans
____ Hispanic Americans
____ European Americans
____ Asian Americans
____ African Americans
____ Other groups

___ Male
___ Female

10. In terms of participation in the program, could you describe the rates of participation
(1 indicates a very low rate to 5 indicates a very high rate)

Female	___debate	___individual events	___mock trial	__outreach
	___other-detail			
Male	___debate	___individual events	___mock trial	__outreach
	___other-detail			
African American	___debate	___individual events	___mock trial	__outreach
	___other-detail			
Asian Americans	___debate	___individual events	___mock trial	__outreach
	___other-detail			
European Americans	___debate	___individual events	___mock trial	__outreach
	___other-detail			
Hispanic Americans	___debate	___individual events	___mock trial	__outreach
	___other-detail			
Native Americans	___debate	___individual events	___mock trial	__outreach
	___other-detail			
Other_____	___debate	___individual events	___mock trial	__outreach
	___other-detail			

11. From your perspective is there Diversity in the Forensics Community? (Please provide the basis for any answer if you can)

12. Is there any recommendation you would make for increasing diversity—events, topics, tournaments, rewards, structure, etc. that would benefit the activity?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The decision rule for inclusion was whether the source dealt with the issues of diversity (very broadly defined) in terms of forensics participation, judging, coaching, community, and philosophy. This bibliography contains all materials referred to in the accompanying literature review and data analysis. There are a large number of additional citations to information available that was obtained through searches of indexes and reference sections of various manuscripts obtained. Readers are cautioned that not every citation could be verified and some citations provided here may contain inaccuracies. Finally, only public sources are used, so citations to convention papers are not included unless they were available through some database and the particular data base will be included as part of citation.

Bartanen, K. (1995). Developing student voices in academic debate through a feminist perspective of learning, knowing, and arguing. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 16,* 1-13.

Baisinger, J. (1996). Response to Beattie: A female participant's view of Cross Examination Debate Association Debate. *Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri Journal, 27,* 106-109.

Beattie, S. (1996). Because we don't like it: A feminist non-participant's view of the Cross Examination Debate Association debate. *Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri Journal, 27,* 97-105.

Beattie, S. (1996). Policy debate still falls short of mediation: A rejoinder to Baisinger, Leonard, Madrid, and Stepp. *Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri Journal, 27,* 120-122.

Bile, J. (1999). Toward the transformation of the dominant social paradigm of argument: Reflections of solving the "women and minority" problem in tournament debate. *International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 116-127.

Billings, A. (2000). Increasing diversity in the 21st Century: Minority participation in competitive individual events. *The Forensic, 85*(4), 1-9.

Bjork, R., & Trapp, R. (1994). Sexual harassment in intercollegiate debate: Introduction. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 31,* 34-35.

Bruschke, J., & Johnson, A. (1994). An analysis of differences in success rates of male and female debaters. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 30,* 162-173.

Cates, C., & Eaves, M. (1996). Reaching new campus audiences: Conducting a campus speech contest as a non-tournament activity. *Southern Journal of Forensics, 1,* 104-111.

Cirlin, A. (1997). A sociological approach to improving style in academic debate. *Southern Journal of Forensics, 2,* 170-201.

Crenshaw, C. (1993). Dominant form and marginalized voices: Argumentation about feminism(s). *CEDA Yearbook, 14,* 72-79.

Crenshaw, C. (1996). Experiential epistemology in feminist argument: Borrowing arguments and what counts as evidence. *Southern Journal of Forensics, 1,* 158-166.

Derryberry, B. (1996). Future considerations for multidimensional forensic programs. *Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri Journal, 27,* 88-95.

Frank, D. (1997). Diversity and the public space: A response to Stepp. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 33,* 195-198.

Friedley, S., & Manchester, B. (1985). An analysis of male/female participation at select national championships. *National Forensic Journal, 3,* 1-11.

Fugate, A. (1997). A response to "Can we make intercollegiate debate more diverse?" *Argumentation and Advocacy, 33,* 191-194.

Griffin, J., & Raider, H. (1992). Women in high school debate. In D. Thomas & J. Hart (Eds.). *Advanced debate: Readings in theory, practice, & teaching* (pp. 8-14). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Hayes, M., & McAdoo, J. (1972). Debate performance: Differences between male and female rankings. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 8,* 127-131.

Hensley, W., & Strother, D. (1968). Success in debate. *Speech Teacher, 17,* 235-237.

Hill, S. (1997, Fall). African American students' motivation to participate in intercollegiate debate. Southern Journal of Forensics, 2(3), 202-235.

Hobbs, J., & Hobbs, J. (1999). The world is too much with us: Sexism in IPDA sponsored debate. *The International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 1-14.

Hunt, S., Garard, D., & Simerly, G. (1997). Reasoning and risk: Debaters as an academically at-risk populations. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 18,* 48-56.

Hunt, S. & Simerly, G. (1999). Recruiting and retaining women and minorities: Exploring student perceptions of intercollegiate debate. *International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 63-70.

Hunt, S., & Simerly, G. (2000). Student perceptions of intercollegiate debate: Exploring students at-risk, sex, and race differences in CEDA. *The International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 128-142.

Kay, J., & Aden, R. (1984). The relationship of judging panel composition to scoring at the 1984 NFA nationals. *National Forensic Journal, 2,* 85-98.

Larson, S., & Vreeland, A. (1985). Gender issues in Cross-Examination periods of CEDA debate. *National Forensic Journal, 3,* 13-28.

Legge, N. (1999). Debating & coaching (as a woman) years ago. *International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 108-115.

Leonard, J. (1996). Response to Beattie: A female director of forensics' view of Cross Examination Debate Association debate. *Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri Journal, 27,* 109-112.

Loge, P. (1991). Black participation in CEDA debate: A quantification and analysis. *CEDA Yearbook 12,* 79-87.

Logue, B. (1986). CEDA: Male/female participation levels: A research report. *CEDA Yearbook 7,* 64-75.

Lowerie, S. (1999). Feminist ethics in competition: Fostering healthy interpersonal relationships through dialogue in intercollegiate debate. *International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 83-95.

Madrid, A. (1996). Response to Beattie: A male coach's view of Cross Examination Debate Association debate. *Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri Journal, 27,* 113-116.

Makau, J. (1992). Revisioning the argumentation course. *Women's Studies in Communication, 15*(2), 79-91.

Mulac, A., Torborg, L., & Bradac, J. (1986). Male/female language differences and attributional consequences in a public speaking situation: Toward an explanation of the gender-linked language effect. *Communication Monographs, 53,* 115-129.

Murphy, J. (1989). Separate but unequal: Women in public address events. *National Forensic Journal, 7,* 115-126.

Nadler, M. (1985). The gender factor in selecting extra-curricular activities. *National Forensic Journal, 3,* 29-36.

Nance, T., & Foeman, A. (1993) Rethinking the basic public speaking course for African American students and other students of color. *Journal of Negro Education, 62*(4), 448-458.

Pettus, A., & Danielson, M. (1994). Coaching intercollegiate debate and raising a family: An analysis of perspectives from the trenches. *National Forensic Journal, 11,* 47-93.

Pineda, R. (1999). Latino/as en Marcha? Suggestions for greater Latino/a participation in college debate. *International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 78-82.

Powell, R., & Collier, M. (1990). Bias in the public speaking classroom. *American Behavioral Scientist, 34*(2), 240-250.

Preston, C. (1997). Principles, participation, and particulars: Choosing activities for forensics programs. *Southern Journal of Forensics, 1,* 267-275.

Preston, C., & Jensen, S. (1995). Community service and recruiting in intercollegiate forensics. *The Forensic, 80,* 1-10.

Renegar, V. (1999). Relational language and post round disclosure: Pathways to change? *International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 96-103.

Rosen, N., Dean, L., & Willis, F. (1978). The outcome of debate in relation to gender, side, and position. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 15,* 17-21.

Sabee, C., & Dyer, S. (1999). E-Debate and community: The affirmative action issue. *International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 104-107.

Simerly, G. (1999). Women and minorities in intercollegiate debate. *Internatinal Journal of Forensics, 2,* 50-51

Simerly, G., Biles, R., & Scott, L. (1992). Strategies to achieve cultural diversity in intercollegiate debate. *Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri Journal, 12,* 28-34.

Soward, S. (1999). Implications of racism toward Hispanic debaters in policy debate. *International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 14-49.

Soward, S. (1999). La Raza in policy debate: Issues and barriers that Latina/o debaters face. *International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 71-77.

Stepp, P. (1996). Response to Beattie: A word from the president of the Cross Examination Debate Association. *Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri Journal, 27,* 117-119.

Stepp, P. (1997). Can we make intercollegiate debate more diverse? *Argumentation and Advocacy, 33,* 176-189.

Stepp, P. (1997). A response to Frank and Fugate. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 33,* 198-199.

Stepp, P., Simerly, G., & Logue, B. (1994). Sexual harassment and gender discrimination in CEDA debate. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 31,* 36-40.

Szwapa, C. (1994). Sexual harassment and gender discrimination in NDT debate. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 31,* 41-44.

Wade, M. (1998). The case for urban debate leagues. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 19,* 60-65.

White, D., & Schabot, D. (2000). Psychological theory and debate. *The International Journal of Forensics, 2,* 143-161.

Wilkins, A., & Hobbs, J. (1997). A feminist critique of intercollegiate debate. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 18,* 57-67.

Williams, D., McGee, D., & McGee, B. (1999). A empirical investigation of race, sex, and class differences in U.S. Collegiate debate. *Internatinal Journal of Forensics, 2,* 52-62.

Table 1

General Descriptive Statistics Gathered about Forensics

Institutional Description (more than one may be checked)

29% Research
73% Teaching
38% Private
49% Public
68% Four year
32% Two year
81% Undergraduate
42% Graduate
7% Land Grant
14% Urban

Source of Funding (what percentage comes from various sources)

21% University allocation
32% College allocation
11% Department allocation
24% Student government
4% Endowment
7% Self financed

Percentage of Program devoted to the following activities:

39% Debate (27 programs were debate only)
39% Individual Events (20 programs were individual events only)
13% Mock Trial (25 programs were mock trial only)
6% Outreach (1 program was outreach only)
3% Other (High School Workshops, Model United Nations, etc.—no program solely participated in these activities)

Table 2

Institution Description and Participant Diversity

	Male	Female	Native American	Hispanic	African American	European American	Asian American
Research	08	**-13**	-03	04	00	03	-04
Teaching	00	00	03	06	-03	09	-10
Private	01	**-13**	-04	-05	02	01	-03
Public	-04	02	05	08	-06	-03	-03
Four-year	-07	**-13**	03	-05	09	-04	-08
Two-year	07	09	-03	08	-07	-06	**18**
Undergraduate	-07	04	-06	01	02	00	**-20**
Graduate	-06	**-13**	-04	11	03	-07	-08
Urban	-05	**-18**	**53**	**36**	-02	**-12**	**16**

These are correlations with decimals omitted
Bold indicates the correlation is significant at $p < .05$

Table 3

Funding Source and Participant Diversity

	Male	Female	Native American	Hispanic	African American	European American	Asian American
University	00	-04	11	01	03	-05	-10
College	-02	**13**	-06	-01	09	03	03
Department	**17**	-07	-07	-05	-03	-02	08
Student Gov't	-07	-04	-04	-11	-02	06	01
Endowment	08	-06	03	**17**	00	00	-11

These are correlations with decimals omitted
Bold indicates the correlation is significant at $p < .05$

Table 4

Measures of Success and Participant Diversity

	Male	Female	Native American	Hispanic	African American	European American	Asian American
Awards	**13**	-08	-11	-01	-08	-01	05
# of Participants	**-13**	**15**	**-21**	01	03	00	**-14**
# of entries	-09	08	-06	-08	02	01	**-16**
Nationals	**14**	-03	-01	-04	-08	02	00
Diversity	03	04	05	09	-02	-03	-08
Fund Raising	-07	03	00	11	07	01	-10
Visibility	05	-04	01	02	04	01	-04

These are correlations with decimals omitted
Bold indicates the correlation is significant at $p < .05$

Table 5

Team Size/Diversity Emphasis and Participant Diversity

	Male	Female	Native American	Hispanic	African American	European American	Asian American
Size of Team	09	**14**	-02	03	09	00	**-18**
Diversity used As Criteria	**-25**	**22**	**22**	**29**	**14**	**-31**	05
Formal Records	**-40**	**48**	-03	**13**	**17**	**-41**	02

These are correlations with decimals omitted
Bold indicates the correlation is significant at $p < .05$